<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks..

Claims 1 through 8, and 11 through 24 are pending, with Claims 1, 11, and 16 being independent. Claims 29 and 33 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 through 3, 5 through 8, and 11 through 23 have been amended.

Claim 8 is objected to for a minor informality therein. In response, while not conceding the propriety of the objection, Claim 8 has been amended to address the points raised by the Examiner.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 on the grounds that a recording medium is not recited. In response, while not conceding the propriety of the objection, Claim 16 has been amended to change "program" to --program stored on a computer-readable medium--, thereby obviating the rejection.

Claims 1, 4, 8, 14, 16, 19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejection, these claims and/or the independent claims from which they depend have been amended to address the points raised by the Examiner. Applicant submits that as amended, these claims now even more clearly satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph. Further, Applicant submits that it is not necessary to satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, for Claim 4 to specify the way in which the bitmap data is used. Applicant submits that it is sufficient for this claim to recite that the bitmap data is stored in a print image file.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) or 103 over US 6,791,709 (<u>Nakamura, et al.</u>), taken alone or in combination with US 2003/0002056 A1 (<u>Yamaguchi, et al.</u>). Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over newly-cited US 6,429,947 B1 (<u>Laverty</u>).[1]

_____

[1] The Examiner has not listed <u>Laverty</u> on the Notice of References Cited; accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this omission be rectified in the next Official Action.

In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejections, independent Claims 1, 11, and 16 have been amended. Applicant submits that as amended, these claims are allowable for the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1 relates to a print control apparatus which uses a spooler to temporarily save intermediate data for output of document data in accordance with a document data print instruction. The apparatus comprises a previewer.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the previewer is configured to read out image data and perform a preview operation. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite a print processor configured to activate the previewer if the previewer is set so as to display the preview when the print processor is activated by the spooler, generate a preview file in response to issuing of an image generation request by the previewer, cause an image data generator to save the image data generated based on the intermediate data in the preview file, and notify the previewer of a file identifier of the preview file. Claim 1 has also been amended to recite that the previewer reads outs the image data based on the file identifier sent by the print processor, and performs the preview operation.

In contrast, the citations to <u>Nakamura, et al.</u> and <u>Yamaguchi, et al.</u> are not understood to disclose or suggest a print processor configured to activate a previewer if the previewer is set so as to display the preview when the print processor is activated by a spooler, generate a preview file in response to issuing of an image generation request by the previewer, cause an image data generator to save the image data generated based on the intermediate data in the preview file, and notify the previewer of a file identifier of the preview file, where the previewer reads outs the image data based on the file identifier sent by the print processor, and performs the preview operation, as recited by amended Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that amended Claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by these citations. For this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn. And because corresponding method and computer program Claims 11

and 16 have been amended in a similar manner, they are allowable for similar reasons. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims also be withdrawn.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable, due to their dependency from the independent base claims, as well as due to additional features that are recited. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gary M. Jacobs/

_____
Gary M. Jacobs
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

GMJ/ant

FCHS_WS 1942786v1